

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XX, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1927

WHOLE No. 555

## The Elementary LATIN CLASSICS

*Caesar:* **THE HELVETIAN WAR.**

Passages from Book I, "Gallic War", simplified. 44 short lessons.

*Caesar:* **INVASION OF BRITAIN.**

Passages from Books IV and V, "Gallic War". 47 lessons.

*Reed:* **JULIA.**

Eighteen short stories, tales of ancient Greece and Rome.  
Easy reading.

*Reed:* **CAMILLA.**

Eight classical stories of Roman life and mythology.

*Livy:* **THE SEVEN KINGS OF ROME.**

Extracts from the first book, very much simplified.

*Livy:* **LEGENDS OF ANCIENT ROME.**

Passages for the second-year pupil, very much simplified.

*Morton:* **LEGENDS OF GODS AND HEROES.**

Simple Latin stories selected from Greek mythology.

---

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York  
Atlanta

Chicago  
Boston

San Francisco  
Dallas

## Franklin and Greene's Selections from Latin Prose Authors for Sight Reading

By SUSAN BRALEY FRANKLIN, Ph.D., formerly Head of Latin Department, Ethical Culture School, New York, and ELLA CATHERINE GREENE, A.B., formerly Instructor in Latin, The Baldwin School, Bryn Mawr, Pa. \$0.64.

**I**N this sight reading material for students in the last year of the High School or in the Freshman year in College, the passages chosen have typical difficulties of syntax, order, and vocabulary.

The work provides rare training in mastering the language and in reading more advanced authors. Inasmuch as the book is not intended to displace any part of the usual course, the selections have not been taken from the texts ordinarily read in Schools.

---

### AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

## JUNIOR LATIN LESSONS

### D'OOGHE AND ROEHM'S

books provide for pupils in Junior High Schools and for those beginning Latin in grades below standard High Schools. Book I, for the first year, and Book II, for the second, closely parallel the recommendations of the Classical Investigation. For lucidity in explaining principles of grammar, and for the delightful vivacity of the readings, the books have few equals.

### GINN AND COMPANY

Boston

New York

Chicago

London

Atlanta

Dallas

Columbus

San Francisco

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XX, No. 25

MONDAY, MAY 9, 1927

WHOLE No. 555

## SOME LITERARY REMINISCENCES IN ENNODIUS'S LIFE OF SAINT EPIPHANIUS

In his *Histoire de la Litterature Latine Chretienne*, 653, M. Pierre de Labriolle writes as follows:

...L'étude de sa langue décèle un réel effort vers la correction grammaticale. Il a essayé d'observer de son mieux les règles de la grammaire classique. Mais il ne pouvait réussir dans la gageure de perpétuer les antiques lois du style littéraire latin en un temps où le latin allait se corrompant de plus en plus: des tours "vulgaires" se mêlent bizarrement à sa rhétorique toute traditionnelle.

Whatever may be said of the language of Ennodius, we cannot help noticing that his *Life of Saint Epiphanius*, Bishop of Pavia, is full of expressions reminiscent of the classical era. There are quotations, of course. But far more important than these are the unconscious reminiscences of the older writers, passages in which sometimes not only the words and the content, but even the swing of the lines recalls the classical authors. It is the purpose of this paper to point out some reminiscences of this sort that are not noted either in the edition of Friedrich Vogel (Berlin, 1885), in the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, or in that of Wilhelm Hartel (Vienna, 1882) in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*.

I. Hartel, page 345, lines 22-24:

...Mox tamen ut supra dictae urbis portas ingressus est, fama quae absentem illum notum fecerat digito coepit ostendere.

This certainly has a resemblance to Cicero, *Pro Archia* 4:

...Post in ceteris Asiae partibus cunctaque Graecia sic eius adventus celebrabantur ut famam ingeni expectatio hominis, expectationem ipsius adventus admiratione superaret.

II. Hartel, 352, 2-4:

...Cuius itineris molestias necessitatesque non valeam per ordinem digerere, nec si mihi centum linguarum fluminibus per meatus inriguos verba fundantur.

This passage was, without doubt, influenced by Vergil, *Aeneid* 6. 625-627:

Non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum,  
ferrea vox, omnes scelerum comprehendere formas,  
omnia poenarum percurrere nomina possim.

III. Hartel, 355.20:

...ubique luctus, pavor ubique et mortis imago plurima.

Both Hartel and Vogel here refer, quite properly, to *Aeneid* 2.369. It is interesting to observe in addition that in Ennodius's arrangement of the words there is chiasmus. The passage in general (Hartel, 355.18-356.23), in its tense nervous movement, suggests Vergil's description.

IV. Hartel, 361.16-17:

...Diem putabant perisse, qui illos sine facinore casu aliquo interveniente fugisset.

This is reminiscent of Suetonius, *Titus* 8:

...atque etiam, recordatus quondam super cenam quod nihil cuiquam toto die praestitisset, memorabilem illam meritoque laudatam vocem edidit, "Amici, diem perdidit".

V. Hartel, 371. 26-372.3:

Audi Italiam numquam a te divisam et multum de animi tui clementia confidentem, quae si una voce uteretur, haec diceret: "Quotiens pro me, si reminisceris, ferratum pectus hostibus obtulisti?"...

This resembles very much the passage in Cicero, *In Catilinam* 1.17, in which Catiline's fatherland is represented as addressing him thus:

...Quae tecum, Catilina, sic agit et quodam modo tacita loquitur: "Nullum iam aliquot annis facinus exstitit nisi per te, nullum flagitium sine te..."

VI. Hartel, 373.8-11:

...Domesticum tibi semper est indulgere supplicibus, sicut superbos obprimere. Sic in utroque fortissimos, ibi per gladium, hic per temperantiam, triumphos adquirit...

Here we have a reminiscence of the famous verse, *Aeneid* 6.853: *parcere subiectos et debellare superbos*.

COLORADO COLLEGE,  
COLORADO SPRINGS

HERBERT EDWARD MIEROW

## SOME ASPECTS OF THE LITERARY TECHNIQUE OF THE AENEID AND THE ODYSSEY<sup>1</sup>

In the *Aeneid*, Aeneas first mentions his own name at 1.378-379: *Sum pius Aeneas*. . . fama super aethera notus. This is, of course, an imitation of Homer, *Odyssey* 9.19-20, 'I am Odysseus, son of Laertes. . . and my fame has reached unto heaven'. In the places assigned to the two statements we have a striking difference between the two poems.

Aeneas appears at the very beginning of the *Aeneid*. Scarcely out of sight of Sicily, the Trojans are joyfully spreading their sails for voyaging over the deep when Juno causes a storm to be let loose against them. Aeneas's limbs are loosed with chilling fear. After the storm has been allayed by Neptune, Aeneas reaches the coast of Africa, and there shoots seven deer for the companions who are with him, and tries to revive their failing spirits. Then comes the meeting with his mother, Venus; during this meeting, in answer to her question, he says, *Sum pius Aeneas*. . . Thereafter, concealed in a hollow cloud, he approaches Carthage, where he is moved to tears by the sight of the great series of pictures giving scenes from the Trojan War. There he sees his other companions safely come to

<sup>1</sup>This paper was read before the Classical Section of the Colorado Education Association, at Denver, on November 13, 1926. It has been somewhat revised, since delivery.

land; and there Ilioneus is telling Dido of his leader Aeneas, renowned for *pietas* and for valor.

Very different is the beginning of the Odyssey. Odysseus does not appear on the scene until Book 5. But he is constantly before the reader's attention. Athena speaks of him to Zeus at the beginning of Book 1, telling how, though he is constrained by Calypso to remain in the Island of Ogygia, he longs to see the smoke leap up from his native land. Telemachus sets out to seek tidings of his father. But the interest is not in Telemachus. The emphasis is always upon the object of his search, Odysseus. In Sparta, at the palace of Menelaus, Helen tells, as appropriate to the occasion, a story of Odysseus, how once, during the siege of Troy, Odysseus disguised himself as a beggar and came as a spy into the city, how she recognized him, but did not betray him, and how he returned to his camp after slaying many Trojans. Menelaus, too, tells a story of the discretion of Odysseus, how Helen, with Deiphobus, walked about the Wooden Horse, and spoke in tones resembling the voices of the wives of the Greeks within the Horse, and how the Greeks would have answered her, and would have been discovered and slain, had not Odysseus restrained them. Menelaus also tells Telemachus of his encounter with Proteus, from whom he learned that Odysseus was in the Island of Ogygia.

This brings us naturally to the next section of the Odyssey. There Odysseus is said to be sitting on a headland, weeping, longing for home (5.82-84). Not until 5.173 does Odysseus speak. His extreme caution appears at once, for he is suspicious of the motive of Calypso in being willing to allow him to leave the island. He shows his tact in speaking only of the wisdom of his wife, not of her beauty. He stresses his desire to return home, but does not make Calypso jealous. Innumerable instances of his craftiness could be cited. In Phaeacia he acts in most circumspect manner. When Arete questions him, he cleverly avoids a direct answer, and tells his adventures without mentioning his name. In the games he gives an exhibition of his unusual prowess. Hence, when at last he begins to narrate the long story of his wanderings, and says, 'I am Odysseus, the son of Laertes', the long-awaited announcement comes with tremendous power, because it is an announcement by a personality, now well known.

It would not be too much to say that our best light on Odysseus and his character comes from what is said about him by others. Eumaeus, the swineherd, prizes his master above his native land and his own parents! Ilioneus speaks to Dido of Aeneas's *pietas*, and martial valor, but we do not have in the Aeneid the elaborate introduction of the chief character that we have in the Odyssey. That is, perhaps, one reason why the character of Aeneas presents so many difficulties. The technique of the Odyssey is here far more elaborate than that of the Aeneid. One would be tempted to say that in method of presentation the Aeneid is direct, the Odyssey indirect<sup>2</sup>. Aeneas walks

directly upon the stage and stays there. Odysseus, on the other hand, is at least as real to us off the stage as on it. He comes, long-awaited. Even when he has returned to his home, he is still awaited! The effect is striking.

There is another point of which we would speak—the central ideas of the poems. What is it that gives unity to each? In the one case, it is the desire of Odysseus to return home, in the other, the necessity which lies upon Aeneas of founding a new Troy. We have put the matter in this fashion because we can thus best bring out a certain difference between the two heroes. Odysseus clearly longs for his home<sup>3</sup>. But Aeneas is under compulsion of the immortal gods. We feel as if he were performing a duty rather than pursuing a great ideal. For example, he leaves Dido, not of his own volition, but at the command of Jupiter, who expresses some disappointment in the character of the hero.

The way in which Vergil and Homer utilize what we may call the opposing forces is a topic of considerable moment. In anger against Odysseus, Poseidon wrecks the raft of Odysseus, and Odysseus is saved only by the kindly intervention of Ino. Later, Poseidon turns into stone the ship of the Phaeacians which had conveyed Odysseus to Ithaca. Whence this wrath? The incident of the Cyclops is of central importance in the Odyssey. Polyphemus calls upon his father, Poseidon, and invokes a curse upon Odysseus that he be slain, or, if this cannot be, that he return home late in time, in evil plight, on the ship of strangers, having lost all his companions, and that he find troubles in his home—a very comprehensive curse! The important thing to remember is that Odysseus's own folly has led him into this difficulty. His comrades had urged him not to linger in the fatal spot. In this one place he acts out of character, but that is because we have here a folktale imbedded in the structure of the Odyssey: the rashness of the hero is characteristic of this story wherever it is found<sup>4</sup>. To be sure, Odysseus's craft effects its escape. Artistically it is a good thing that the hero's misfortunes should have their origin in his own folly. The Cyclops's curse is fulfilled. But Poseidon's active hostility to Odysseus ceases when Odysseus reaches his native land. Nevertheless, according to the curse Odysseus finds trouble in his own house.

In the Aeneid, Juno is the opponent of Aeneas. The cause of her wrath is the fact that Paris, a Trojan, had given the prize to the wrong person—so she thought—in the contest of beauty. Aeneas is thus one—just one—of a hated race, and yet he must suffer at Juno's hands. In other words, the cause of Juno's anger lies outside Aeneas<sup>5</sup>. Accordingly, the

<sup>2</sup>But Odysseus had a home, a real home, known for years, for which to long. Aeneas had lost the home he had loved! C. K. >.

<sup>3</sup>See the article entitled On Some Various Forms of the Legend of the Blinded Cyclops, printed, as Appendix II (pages 550-554) of the edition of Odyssey 1-12 by W. Walter Merry and James Riddell (second edition, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1886).

<sup>4</sup>Does not this very fact, the injustice of Juno's pursuit of a whole race because one member of it had not given her the thing she craved, enlist our sympathies against her, and for the race, especially for its leader, *insignis pietate vir, pius Aeneas*? In twentieth century Americanese, Juno, in her wrath against Paris and the Trojans, shows herself a hard loser, a poor sport. C. K. >.

<sup>5</sup>We must remember here that the Iliad had pretty well advertised Odysseus. There was nothing, in Latin, preceding the Aeneid, to do a like service, adequately, for Aeneas! C. K. >.



effect upon the reader of the portrayal of her wrath is not so vivid. We do not feel the anger of Juno as a real thing because its origin is so remote. It is not a living part of the epic<sup>6</sup>.

On the other hand, her influence is prominent throughout the poem. She causes Aeolus to raise the storm; she stirs up the Italians to war against Aeneas. In this respect the technique of the Aeneid is perhaps better than that of the Odyssey, for, after Odysseus reaches Ithaca, Poseidon ceases to be a notable figure in the poem.

But, in spite of all this, the technique of the Aeneid is not, as a whole, as effective as is that of the Odyssey. It is somewhat difficult to feel that Aeneas has an overpowering call to found a new city, and to feel that the hate of Juno has a sufficient relation to the hero of the poem. In the Odyssey the longing of Odysseus for his home is real and our anxiety for him is poignant.

COLORADO COLLEGE,  
COLORADO SPRINGS

HERBERT EDWARD MIEROW

#### A POET-HISTORIAN AND A LUCRETIAN MOTIF

It will be of interest to students of Lucretius to notice a rather unexpected use of a well-known Lucretian theory by a modern poet, Mr. D. H. Lawrence<sup>1</sup>. His book, which purports to be a survey of the chief movements of European history from the Roman period to the present day, need not be taken seriously here. The student of classical history will ask no further clue to its nature than the fact that the history of Rome to the time of Diocletian occupies precisely the same amount of space (8 pages) as the reign of Constantine, and that in compensation for this undue stress on one Emperor the whole history of the Byzantine Empire from 334 to 1453 A. D. is compressed into four paragraphs on one page! To a literary artist this may be good history; to the historian it will certainly seem mere literature.

What is of particular interest, however, is the theory upon which the book is based. In the Introduction for the Teacher we read as follows (x):

At the present moment, history must either be graphic or scientific. The old bad history is abolished. The old bad history consisted of a register of facts. It drew up a chart of human events, as one might draw up a chart of the currants in a plum-pudding, merely because they happen promiscuously to be there. No more of this.

The new history is different. It is, we repeat, either graphic or scientific....

In "graphic" history, we are to understand, the personal element is stressed. This will be attractive to children. In "scientific" history analysis is stressed. This is to

<sup>6</sup><This I utterly deny. Think of just one thing, the part that, through Allecto, the Fury, Juno plays in hurrying Turnus, and, through him, the Latins, into war (7.406-474), though such act involves a 'pollution of peace' (7.467), of the compact that Latinus, *non modo sua sponte, sed etiam ultro*, had made with Aeneas and the Trojans (7.259-273). C. K.>

<sup>1</sup>The first edition of Mr. Lawrence's work appeared under the pseudonym Lawrence H. Davison, with the title *Movements in European History* (London, Humphrey Milford, 1921). It has recently been reissued in a second (illustrated) edition, with the same title, under the name of David Herbert Lawrence (Oxford University Press, 1925. Pp. xiii + 354). The references in this paper are to the later edition.

appeal to the University student. Mr. Lawrence explains that his book is written (xi) for "adolescents". It is motivated (xi) by the recognition of

... great surging movements which rose in the hearts of men in Europe, sweeping human beings together into one great concerted action, or sweeping them apart for ever on the tides of opposition....

These movements, Mr. Lawrence says (xii-xiii), are irrational:

Thus the Crusades, or the Renaissance, these are great motions from within the soul of mankind. They are the sheer utterance of life itself, the logic only appearing afterwards.... All that the reason can do, in discovering the logical consequence of such passion and its effects, afterwards, is to realise that life *was* so, mysteriously, creatively, and beyond cavil.

Now this conception is clearly suggestive of Heraclitus's theory of the unity of human phenomena as manifested in their constant change. The fact that Heraclitus's theory, as is, of course, common knowledge, was the starting-point of Lucretius's doctrine of the dualism represented by Mars and Venus—the destructive and the constructive flux—gives particular interest to the passage with which Mr. Lawrence closes his book (344):

So the cycle of European history completes itself, phase by phase, from imperial Rome, through the mediaeval empire and papacy to the kings of the Renaissance period, on to the great commercial nations, the government by the industrial and commercial middle classes, and so to that last rule, that last oneness of the labouring people. So Europe moves from oneness to oneness, from the imperial unity to the unity of the labouring classes, from the beginning to the end.

But we must never forget that mankind lives by a twofold motive: the motive of peace and increase, and the motive of contest and martial triumph. As soon as the appetite for martial adventure and triumph in conflict is satisfied, the appetite for peace and increase manifests itself, and *vice versa*. It seems a law of life....

Surely the second paragraph of this quotation is nothing more than a concise rephrasing of the famous introduction to Lucretius's poem. The entire phraseology, especially in the use of the terms "increase" and "martial", seems to me to be almost sure proof of Mr. Lawrence's indebtedness to Lucretius's doctrine<sup>2</sup>. Compare Lucretius 1.1-5, 29-40, with particular emphasis on the italicized expressions:

*Aeneadum genetrix, hominum divomque voluptas,  
alma Venus, caeli subter labentia signa  
quae mare navigerum, quae terras frugiferentis  
concelebras, per te quoniam genus omne animantium  
concupitur visitque exortum lumina solis....  
effice ut interea fera moenera militum  
per maria ac terras omnis sopita quiescant,  
nam tu sola potes tranquilla pace iuvare  
mortalis, quoniam belli fera moenera Mavors  
armipotens regit, in gremium qui saepe tuum se*

<sup>2</sup>It would also seem reasonably certain that Mr. Lawrence became acquainted with Lucretius's idea not from the original, or even from a translation, but from some such derivative source as the well-known essay on Lucretius in Professor George Santayana's book, *Three Philosophical Poets*, 19-70 (Harvard University Press, 1910). Compare especially pages 38-44 of this essay with the quotations above.

reicit aeterno devictus vulnere amoris,  
 atque ita suspiciens tereti cervice reposta  
 pascit amore avidos inhians in te, dea, visus,  
 eque tuo pendet resupini spiritus ore.  
 Hunc tu, diva, tuo recubantem corpore sancto  
 circumfusa super, suavis ex ore loquellas  
 funde *petens placidam Romanis, incluta, pacem.*

'Mother of Aeneas's line, thou dear delight of men and gods, bountiful Venus... forasmuch as every kind of breathing thing through thee is shaped.... Bring now to pass on sea and land that slumber-lulled may lie the cruel works of war (for none but thou can succour man with restful peace, since battle-mighty Mars holds guidance of the cruel works of war)... and for the Romans, far-known goddess, reposeful peace implore'.

In the closing sentences of Mr. Lawrence's book, sentences which follow, directly, the quotation given above from page 344, a rather muddled Teutonic 'Uebermensch' supplants the classical divinities as prime movers in human history (344):

...Therefore a great united Europe of productive working-people, all materially equal, will never be able to continue and remain firm unless it unites also round one great chosen figure, some hero who can lead a great war, as well as administer a wide peace. It all depends on the will of the people. But the will of the people must concentrate in one figure, who is also supreme over the will of the people. He must be chosen, but at the same time responsible to God alone. Here is a problem of which a stormy future will have to evolve the solution.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE, CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.  
 NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

### HROTSVITHA ON THE STAGE

Mr. Oswald R. Kuehne's bibliographical note on the revival of interest in Hrotsvitha<sup>1</sup> may be supplemented by the notice of a recent performance<sup>2</sup> of three of Hrotsvitha's plays. The results were quite startling, at any rate to one who knew the plays only in the original and who had seen no cause for dissenting from the received opinion that they were of interest only to dramatic antiquarians. According to a note on the program these plays were, with the exception of a single performance of the Callimachus and the Abraham in London in 1914, now for the first time put on the stage in English<sup>3</sup>. The program announced also that the plays were "under the sensitive and imaginative direction of Wladimir Nelidoff", and for once a theatrical 'blurb' seemed entirely justified, for "sensitive" and "imaginative" are the adjectives which most accurately describe the performance.

The stage used for the performance was tiny, and lacked most of the properties which we have come to feel almost indispensable in dramatic presentation.

<sup>1</sup>Recent Literature Concerning Hrotsvitha, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.149-150.

<sup>2</sup>At the Lawren Theatre Studio, New York City, April 5-11, 1926.

<sup>3</sup>The name of the translator is not given on the program, but, if I recall correctly, mention was made of a Mr. St. John, and Mr. Kuehne's citation of Mr. Christopher St. John's version of Hrotsvitha (Chatto and Windus, 1923) leads me to suppose that that translation was employed.

The very limitations, however, necessitating the frank adoption of a conventional rather than a realistic style of acting<sup>4</sup>, made for greater dramatic appeal. Much thought had evidently been expended upon the costumes, which the actors wore without the awkwardness of the usual modern actor dressed up in ancient clothes, and upon the stage settings, which were simple but imaginative, and, in the case of the last play, Callimachus, strikingly effective. The result was that no one in the audience, even those most obsessed with the notion of Hrotsvitha as a medieval bookworm, could have failed to see that these plays are 'good theater', and that Hrotsvitha has other claims to consideration than that she was a fourth-rate or fifth-rate imitator of Terence.

The play called Abraham<sup>5</sup> deals with the seduction of a young anchorite, her dissolute life in a brothel, the visit of her uncle Abraham, and her rescue and repentance—a simple story told simply. Its Latin text seems bald and dry; acted on the stage the play moves with firmness and conviction.

In the Callimachus<sup>6</sup> the complexities of the theme are less skilfully handled. Drusiana rejects the advances of Callimachus, and the disappointed suitor, on her sudden death, attempts to revenge himself on her dead body. He is assisted by a cynical rascal, Fortunatus, but the attempt is frustrated by the divine interposition of a serpent that kills the conspirators. Then John, a pious man of God, brings about the resurrection of Drusiana and of the repentant Callimachus, but Fortunatus spurns salvation and his second death is accompanied by curses which speed him on to hell.

The third play, Dulcitius<sup>7</sup>, was played as a combination of broad farce, very capably acted, and sincerely moving drama. Three Christian virgins defy the Emperor Diocletian when he orders them to renounce their faith. They are thrown into chains. Dulcitius, the prison guard, attempts to assault them, but, *mente captus*, makes love instead to pots and pans, and becomes a laughing-stock to his wife and his soldiers. Two of the virgins are burnt at the stake (the symbolic action here was excellently contrived); the third is carried off to a brothel, but is saved by angels.

The impression left by these plays is that they might well engage the attention of some of our Collegiate dramatic societies, especially in view of the recent splendid performance of Plautus's Aulularia<sup>8</sup>.

WASHINGTON SQUARE COLLEGE, CASPER J. KRAEMER, JR.  
 NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

<sup>4</sup>So, for example, the hermit Abraham suggested the long journey from his cell to the wicked city by leading a horse (feigned, of course) from one end of the small stage to the other; and in the Dulcitius, when the virgins were burned at the stake, a candle was placed before them and they assumed rigid positions with arms crossed on the breast. These conventions, skilfully devised and smoothly performed, were in every way satisfactory to the imagination—however ridiculous they sound in cold print.

<sup>5</sup>The full title is Lapsus et Conversio Mariae Neptis Abrahamae Heremicolae. I use the text of Carl Strecker (Leipzig, Teubner, 1906).

<sup>6</sup>Resuscitatio Drusianae et Callimachi <sic>.

<sup>7</sup>Passio Sanctarum Virginum Agapis Chioniae et Hirenæ.

<sup>8</sup>By The Latin Players of Hamilton College, in Latin, on March 7, 1927, in the Chapel of Hunter College, New York City. The large audience, which packed the house, bore witness to a widespread interest in classical revivals, and was enthusiastic in its praise of Plautus's text as an effective vehicle for dramatic expression.

## REVIEWS

Aristotle's *Metaphysics*. A Revised Text, With Introduction and Commentary. By W. D. Ross. Oxford University Press, American Branch (1924). Two Volumes. Pp. clxvi + 366; 528. \$16.00.

It is manifestly impossible to give, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY*, a really adequate review of Professor W. D. Ross's monumental edition of the *Metaphysica* of Aristotle. Detailed discussion of the Greek text would in itself present printing difficulties and difficulties of cost which *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* is not in position to meet, passionate as is its interest in all things Greek. But is at least possible to call attention to the book, and to give a hint of the wealth of its contents.

These are as follows:

Volume I: Books Referred to (ix-xii); Introduction: I, The Structure of the *Metaphysics* (xiii-xxxiii), II, Socrates, Plato, and the Platonists (xxxiii-lxxvi), III, Aristotle's Metaphysical Doctrine (lxxvi-cxxx), IV, Aristotle's Theology (cxxx-cliv), V, The Text of the *Metaphysics* (clv-clxvi); *Metaphysics*, Books A-E, Text (pages 1-113, unnumbered), Commentary (114-366).

Volume II: *Metaphysics*, Books Z-N, Text (pages 1-158, unnumbered); Commentary (159-500); Index Verborum <Graecorum> (501-526); Index to the Introduction and Commentary (527-528). It is explained in a note to page 528 that the latter Index is "simply supplementary to the *Index Verborum*. E. g. under 'Plato' will be found only references to passages in which Aristotle does not explicitly mention him".

I can never understand how, when an author has put into a work the enormous labor and the wide and deep learning which Professor Ross put into this work, he fails to add a good Index Rerum, by whose aid the student shall be put in position to find easily the particular things he wants or needs in his own studies. Professor Ross's Index Verborum <Graecorum> serves such needs only in part.

The Apparatus Criticus, set beneath the text, is extensive.

To Aristotelian scholars the most interesting and most important part of the work will, no doubt, be the discussion of the text of the *Metaphysica*. In constituting his text, Professor Ross himself collated, throughout (clv), "one manuscript of great value which was ignored both by Bekker and by Christ, viz. Vindobonensis phil. gr. C".

... The manuscript has been minutely described by Mr. F. H. Fobes <of Amherst College> in the *Classical Review* xxvii (1913), 249-250, and its relations to other manuscripts, so far as the *Meteorologica* is concerned, have been discussed by him in *Classical Philology* x (1915), 188-214, and in his edition<sup>1</sup> of the *Meteorologica* (1919)... It appears to belong to the beginning of the tenth century and to be the earliest extant manuscript of the *Metaphysics*...

On page clxvi Professor Ross has two interesting paragraphs:

A good deal has been done for the text by Sylburg, Brandis, Bekker, Schwegler, and Christ; but all these together have done less for it than Bonitz, who, partly by careful study of the Greek commentators, partly by attention to what the argument requires, has convincingly amended almost every page of the work.

I have paid special attention to the punctuation, a change in which often makes emendation unnecessary.

One would suppose that every editor of a Greek or a Latin text would study the ancient commentators, would give heed to "what the argument requires", and would pay special attention to the punctuation. But we all know, from sad experience, that in many an edition one or the other of these three things, sometimes all three have been sadly neglected.

The Commentary is elaborate, offering 595 full pages of notes to 271 partial pages of text. To "each section of the commentary (usually to the commentary on each chapter)" of the text, Professor Ross prefixes an analysis which is distinguished typographically from the Commentary itself. On page vi Professor Ross writes thus: "The general course of Aristotle's thought can be best seen by reading the analysis continuously".

For a very valuable review of Professor Ross's great work the reader should consult *The Classical Review* 39.176-180 (November-December, 1925). This was written by Professor Werner Jaeger, a German authority on Aristotle whom Professor Ross mentions with great respect. Of Mr. Ross's text of the *Metaphysica*, independently constituted by him, Professor Jaeger writes as follows (178):

The text of a work which, owing to the difficulty of its contents, has been as long neglected by professional scholars as the *Metaphysics*, was bound to gain especially by systematic philosophical interpretation; and I had already shown that emendation based on such interpretation had here a great field. Mr. Ross has not only collated all emendations worth considering contributed since Christ's edition, but has also himself emended the text in many places, especially by the simple means of correct punctuation<sup>2</sup>. The commentary shows at every step the advance on Bonitz. It justifies the text where necessary, explains the connexion of thought, and illuminates by parallels the frequent verbal difficulties. Much here, of course, remains controversial, as is only to be expected with such material...

On pages 178-180 Professor Jaeger discusses the Introduction to Professor Ross's work. He begins thus:

... It is here that the divergence between the tendency of present-day German work and that which Ross's book reflects comes most strikingly to view. Since the time of Eduard Zeller, who still built his picture of Socrates and of the history of thought from Socrates to Aristotle predominantly on the evidence of Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, we <i. e. the Germans> have reached a pretty general agreement that this evidence can only be used with great caution. It is significant that Aristotle, looking back, could see the sense of the whole development and of its details only by regarding it as the 'pre-history' of his own philosophy... if we want to know what Socrates or Plato intended, we cannot possibly accept the extract from the facts which Aristotle gives in his account of them. For this extract is oriented by the philosopher's attitude of historical selfanalysis, and is therefore itself a piece of constructive philosophical thought, a transformation of the actuality. The question is not whether this evidence is 'false' or 'correct', but how to make the distinction between the development as Aristotle from his angle was bound to see it and as it actually was.

<sup>2</sup>The words "but has...punctuation" are Professor Jaeger's exact words.

<sup>1</sup>For a notice of this edition see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 13.64.



Later (179), Professor Jaeger describes Professor Ross's attitude as follows:

The peculiarity of Mr. Ross's Introduction is that it views Aristotle entirely from within, from the dogma of his system and from his historical conception of himself, not from an external standpoint. In a sense he sees him with the eyes of a latter-day Peripatetic. This applies not only to the historical section: the sketch of the metaphysical doctrine is similarly conceived. It is not a chapter in the history of thought, but is esoteric and doxographical....

I need not say that I am not in the slightest degree an Aristotelian. But, layman though I am, I shall venture to say that to my mind the sort of work Professor Ross did is, for the present, as it will be for some time to come, of more solid value than the sort of work the Germans are doing on Aristotle (if I understand aright Professor Jaeger's remarks). Each mode of procedure has its own peculiar shortcomings and dangers, but those that attach to the procedure of the Germans are, I think, the greater. I well remember the last time I read the *Germania* of Tacitus with undergraduates. I became utterly wearied and disgusted with the endless discussions, particularly by German scholars, of early German institutions, discussions theoretically based on the *Germania* of Tacitus, but in point of fact based on nothing, just because, in many a place in the *Germania*, no scholar knows, no scholar ever has known, exactly what Tacitus meant. Till the meaning of Tacitus in such passages is determined, to the satisfaction of two or three scholars at least, all accounts of early German institutions that are said to rest on such passages are mere idle intellectual exercises—I might better say mere consumings of time. So, it would seem to my layman soul, the text of the *Metaphysics* of Aristotle, the punctuation of the work, and the meaning of Aristotle's words—matters on which, it is clear from the writings both of Professor Jaeger and Professor Ross, the last word has not yet been said—must be pretty definitely determined before the method of the Germans is as fully in order as Professor Jaeger believes it to be.

In our efforts to understand ancient works, we need to imitate the scientists in one respect—we need to sterilize those works, to exclude rigorously from our study of them ideas not strictly germane, however valuable those ideas are in themselves. By such sterilization I myself, I venture to think, supplied a very simple interpretation of a much mooted passage, Horace, *Sermones* 1.10.44-45, *molle atque facetum Vergilio adnuerunt gaudentes rure Camenae*. See my paper, *Molle Atque Facetum*, *The American Journal of Philology* 38 (1917), 194-199. By bringing the reader back to the year in which these words were written, and rigorously excluding all ideas that were born in later, far later, days, I showed, I feel sure, that scholars, from Quintilian down, had been misinterpreting entirely simple words (*molle atque facetum*), and had been imposing on a world busy enough already the hapless necessity of reading long discussions not in the least germane to Horace's words.

CHARLES KNAPP

*Die Antike Münze als Kunstwerk*. Von Kurt Regling. Berlin: Schoetz und Parrhysius (1924). Pp. iv + 148. 45 Plates (907 Figures).

In his monograph, *Die Antike Münze als Kunstwerk*, Dr. Kurt Regling reminds us, in his opening sentences, that it is not necessary that a coin, in order to fulfill the purpose of its existence, should be a work of art, a fact which may be vividly impressed upon us if we inspect the contents of our purses. But, fortunately for the artist, the issue of coins in Greece was not always governed by purely economic considerations. The important centers of commerce, such as Athens, Aegina, Corinth, and Rhodes, were, indeed, primarily concerned to insure the acceptance of their money by their business connections, and so held steadily to their old familiar types which were recognized throughout their sphere of trade. But places which were less interested in foreign mercantile adventure were in a different position as regards their currency. To the average Greek town it was really of no economic importance whether a local silver coinage was issued or not. So far as we can judge, the mintage of silver in these towns would not bring any profit to the treasury of the State. For purposes of external receipts and payments the coins which drifted down the avenues of trade from the headquarters of the 'standard', Athenian, Corinthian, or whatever it might be, would be accepted and passed on without trouble, and internal transactions probably proceeded largely by barter, until the introduction of small bronze currency at a comparatively late date in the history of Greek coinage. So the smaller towns struck coins only at rare intervals and in moderate quantities, rather as medals than as specie. The purpose would be to commemorate some notable event, to provide an exceptional reward, even, perhaps, to serve as an advertisement. Under these circumstances it was natural not only that greater attention should be paid to the artistic execution of the coins, but that a freer hand should be given to the designers in the choice of types. This explains how it comes to pass that, as Dr. Regling notes, the pieces which he has selected to illustrate his thesis are predominantly from cities only of the second rank of importance in the Greek world.

The book is almost entirely devoted to an analysis of the principles of art as applied to the production of coins in Greece before the time of Alexander the Great. Only short notices at the close are given to the Hellenistic and the Roman periods. The historical account is divided into two periods: the archaic period, from 700 to 480 B. C., and the period of finest art, from 480 to 323 B. C. These periods correspond to those usually adopted in dealing with other branches of Greek art, as it is Dr. Regling's purpose to trace the relation between the work of the die-engraver and that of the artist on a larger scale, notably the sculptor. These two sections are further subdivided in the illustrations, the first into three, with intermediate breaks at the years 570 and 520, the second into four, with breaks at 440, 400, and 359. But, while the relation of these subdivisions to the history of sculpture is noted in the text, and the grouping of the coins in the Plates is



instructive, the detailed discussion of the developments of style and technique is judiciously based on the two longer periods.

This discussion is most minute and thorough. It is by no means easy reading, involving as it does a constant reference from the text to the Plates, sometimes two or three times in a single line. After an explanation of the great principles governing the choice of types for coins, including the purport of the types, which are in their essence the signatures of the issuers intended to guarantee the coins, Dr. Regling proceeds to analyze the main points of style in each of his two periods. He deals separately with animal and human figures, drapery, the treatment of the field and ornamentation. In discussing the later period he adds special sections on the questions of the extent to which coin-types were original creations and of the influence of pictorial art on their designers. The local peculiarities which can be discerned in certain districts are also noted. The only criticism which we should make on this masterpiece of compression is that the facts are too highly packed: the nourishment is so highly concentrated that it is difficult of digestion.

Presumably, however, Dr. Regling had to work within prescribed limits of space, and this may explain also why he has dealt so summarily with the Hellenistic and the Roman periods. It is true that Greek coins after the time of Alexander the Great were no longer such charming works of art as they had been for a couple of centuries previously, but they are not without interest for the history of style, and such points as the development of portraiture and the growth of the tendency to reproduce larger designs of sculpture or painting might well have received fuller illustration, if room had been available. Further, the rise of local schools of glyptic under the Roman Empire should not be entirely overlooked.

It may be hoped that Dr. Regling will be able to supplement this book with another to carry his survey in its fulness down to Byzantine times. Meanwhile, we may be very thankful for what we have got. This volume is a joy to any lover of art, if it be merely to turn over the plates and feast his eyes on beauty. If, in more enquiring moments, he desires to know how and why these exquisite things came to be, he will find ample explanation in the text.

OXFORD,  
ENGLAND

J. G. MILNE

The Aegean Civilization. By Gustave Glotz. New York: Alfred A. Knopf (1925). Pp. xvi + 422. \$5.00.

The book called *The Aegean Civilization* is a translation of a French volume published in 1923 in the series of works entitled *L'Évolution de l'Humanité*. Mr. Alfred A. Knopf, with his usual enlightened interpretation of a publisher's opportunities, has included some of the books of the French set in a series which he is issuing under the title of *The History of Civilization*, under the editorship of C. K. Ogden. The translation, which is made by M. R. Dobie and E. M. Riley, is an excellent rendering of the original, with the occasional

appearance of unusual, but good, English words that have been taken over from the French. It is also accurate, even to the inclusion of some errors that occur in the original.

Although the book was first published in 1923, the present translation includes corrections and additions made in 1924 to the French work, and a final additional note written in 1925. For the sake of English readers a brief account will be given of the scope and the value of the work.

The work is, in fact, an encyclopedic study covering every phase of the Aegean civilization. The subject is discussed with wisdom and sanity. Facts, rather than opinions, are presented; throughout there is evidence of extraordinary knowledge of available material. Where controversial views can not be avoided, they are mentioned, but are not emphasized. After an Introduction that gives an historical survey of the Aegean basin, its climate, its products, and its people, there is a statement concerning the excavations and concerning the resultant chronology of successive periods of occupation, as determined by Sir Arthur Evans and other workers in Crete, and by the scholars who have studied the related civilization of the Greek mainland.

The subject is treated in four books. The first deals with material life, which includes the physical type, dress and adornment, arms and armor, the house and the palace. The second book, entitled *Social Life*, discusses the social system and the government, agriculture, industry, trade, and international relations. Religious life, the subject presented in the third book, covers fetishism, anthropomorphic divinities, places of worship, religious ceremonies, the cult of the dead, and games. Finally, Book Four treats of the artistic and intellectual life, with chapters on art, on writing and language.

This statement of the contents is sufficient to indicate the wide range of information that is here traversed. But the presentation of the material is always in a readable form and in a pleasant style. A selected Bibliography is appended, and adequate references to sources of statements are given for the use of scholars. But the book is admirably suited to the requirements of the average intelligent reader.

Minor criticisms have no place in a review of a book that presents in well balanced form such a vast amount of knowledge, but a word of warning should be raised against the tendency, common among Cretan specialists, to attribute too many origins to Crete. On page 184 the student is invited to seek "in the workshops of the Aegean" the origin of any object of the second millennium that "marks an advance", whether it be found "in the Mediterranean countries or in the depths of the European continent on the banks of the Rhine or the Danube". Further, we are told on page 235 that Zeus Labrandeus got his name "from across the sea", and *labrys* is listed on page 387 as a Cretan word, although Plutarch, *Quaestiones Graecae* 45, specifically states that it is Lydian. The chapter on writing and language recalls the fact that, in spite of the passage of many years, the Cretan written

documents, like the Etruscan, remain undeciphered. Some day, when the linguistic key is discovered, more important information about these interesting peoples will be revealed. Four Plates and eighty-seven Illustrations in the text add to the attractiveness of a well printed, well written book.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

T. LESLIE SHEAR

**Madness in Ancient Literature.** By Ainsworth O'Brien-Moore. Princeton University Dissertation. Weimar, R. Wagner Sohn (1924). Pp. 228.

Since one's impression concerning the subject of Dr. O'Brien-Moore's dissertation would probably be that the author was undertaking an impossible task, it is only fair to let him state, himself, the scope and purpose of his investigation (Introduction, 7, 10):

The chief interest of this dissertation will lie in the study of the elevated representations of madness in literature of the grand manner; the popular, medical, comic, and, to a still lesser extent, the social and legal aspects of the subject will be considered only as a contrast and background to the literary. We shall attempt to show that a conception and delineation of madness were built up in poetry which, though ultimately rooted in popular thought, were yet sublimated until almost unrecognizable, until, as poets became less and less living interpreters of contemporary thought and more and more a reflection of their predecessors, certain types and the depiction of madness practically became conventions....

Lacking thus any scientific treatises based on observed data, or a sufficient number of reported instances, we must determine the ancients' conceptions of madness from indirect references. Here again we are beset with difficulties. Just as the ancients grouped an amorphous mass of particulars under the term madness, so conceptions of madness, both as to its nature and cause, vary with time, point of view, individuals, and even within the work of individuals. There is a medical, a popular, and a poetic conception of madness; Aeschylus' conception of madness differs from Sophocles' and Vergil's; Euripides presents different conceptions of madness in Orestes and Agave. When one considers that in Medicine madness is caused by a superfluity of black bile, that in popular thought it is due to possession by demons, that in Aeschylus, as we hope to show, madness is contact with a supernatural world and very difficult to distinguish, so far as the validity of its judgments goes, from sanity, that the Ancients tended to include among the phenomena of madness on the one hand epilepsy, on the other the phenomena of religious ecstasy, as seen both in bacchic frenzy and in mantic inspiration, and further, that the conceptions of one poet influenced his successors, one may realize the impossibility of making any absolute generalizations. It will be necessary, rather, to consider the particulars....

The Table of Contents is as follows:

Introduction (7-11); The Popular Conception of Madness (11-20); The Medical Conception (20-36); The Reverberations of the Medical Conception in Literature (36-52); The General Attitude of Comedy Towards Madness (53-66); Madness in Elevated Literature: Homer and the Deistic Conception (67-74); Aeschylus (74-101); Sophocles and Bacchylides (101-114); Euripides (114-149); Madness After the Tragedians (149-155); The Roman Tragedians (155-162); Vergil (162-179); The Fury after Vergil (180-

189); The Late Greek Epic: Quintus Smyrnaeus (189-192); Nonnus (192-201); Seneca's *Hercules Furens* (202-206); The Madness of Mantic Inspiration (206-228).

There is no Bibliography, nor is there an Index.

From the list of chapters one can judge the probable usefulness of the dissertation as a commentary on the passages in ancient Greek and Latin literature in which occur delineations of persons reputed to be mad or allusions to madness and madmen. In the reviewer's opinion the sequence of the headings is logical except as regards the phenomenon of madness in comedy. Inasmuch as a great part of comedy is a burlesque of the serious sides and activities of life <and of tragedy, as presented on the stage: c. k.>, would it not be natural to give priority to a discussion of madness in tragedy? At all events, to place comments upon any phases of comedy before a consideration of the same phases of the Homeric epic is a clear case of hysteron proteron, for which the only possible excuse could be that, after all, the later classical writers were practically just as ignorant about the nature of madness as were the earlier.

Most of the dissertation makes good reading. Though it deals, of necessity, in an indefinite way with an indefinite subject, it illuminates a number of important passages in ancient classical literature, chiefly in the Greek tragedians. Every reader will be indebted to the author for his studies of Sophocles's portrayal of Ajax and of Euripides's portrayal of Agave; no student of the Ajax or of the Bacchae can henceforth afford to dispense with Dr. O'Brien-Moore's studies.

In undertaking monographs for the purpose of extracting historical or scientific facts from literature there is always the danger that the writer may forget the nature of poetry and endeavor to deduce much more than the sources actually contain. This danger, however, Dr. O'Brien-Moore carefully shuns, invariably respecting the true function of poetry. Nevertheless, restraint in this particular has not led him to exercise the same virtue in another respect, for in his treatment of several of his topics he is prolix and not always quite relevant. Nonnus, for instance, deserves only a fraction of the attention given to him. Had the author possessed a stronger confidence in the intelligence and the memory of the class of persons that are likely to read this kind of study, he could have spared himself the making of many repetitions and explicit allusions that tend only to lengthen the work unduly and thus to detract from its usefulness. However, one must commend highly the excellent English style in which the dissertation is written. Frequently, the temperament that can appreciate and command a high standard of literary composition inclines to be neglectful of accuracy in the details of reference and of printing, but in these respects Dr. O'Brien-Moore has been exact and painstaking almost to the degree of perfection<sup>1</sup>.

UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO,  
LONDON, ONTARIO

W. SHERWOOD FOX

<sup>1</sup>In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 14.150-151 there was a review, by Professor D. M. Robinson, of a University of Michigan Dissertation, *Madness in Greek Thought and Custom*, by Dr. Agnes Carr Vaughan (Baltimore, J. H. Furst Company, 1919). C. K.>.